REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion below.

The present Patent Office Action contains a new grounds of rejection citing a new reference to Russell et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,391,400. More specifically, claims 1-3, 15, 17, 18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Russell et al. using the statement of the rejection contained at item 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the Patent Office Action. Claims 4-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Russell et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,034 while claim 8 is rejected as unpatentable over the reference to Coleman U.S. Patent No. 4,731,289. Presumably this was to be a combination with Russell et al.

Claims 7, 16 and 21 are rejected over the combination of Russell et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,976,702 while claims 8 and 9 are further rejected over Russell et al. in view of the '034 reference. Lastly, claims 10-12 are rejected over the combination of Russell et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,092,915 to Rensch.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on the grounds that each of independent claims 1, 18 and 20 provide method or structural limitations not shown or disclosed or made obvious by the reference to Russell et al. or any combination of Russell et al. with references of record.

The newly cited and applied reference to Russell et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,391,400 concerns a thermal control film for use in glazing. Reference is made in the rejection to column 2, lines 11-24 of Russell et al. for showing the coating of the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that the heat reflective coating in Russell et al., discussed at column 2, lines 11-24, must be integrated inside of a double glazing. Heat loss can only be reduced by applying the coating of glaze on the inner side of a double glazing unit to reduce the U-value. This approach has been discussed in previous responses and once again Applicants submit that it is significantly different than the presently claimed invention concerning a heat-reflective coating providing a radiation exchange with a passenger. Applicants invention does not specifically improve the insulation.

In order to understand the prior art double glazing feature, the attached drawing illustrates how an inner glass panel and an outer glass panel are separated by an air space. With the double glazing disclosed in the primary reference to Russell et al., the "low E" coating is located on the outer surface of the inner glass panel. This arrangement is completely different from the presently claimed invention which requires the "low E" coating to be located on the inner surface of a structure facing the passenger. It is quite clear that the arrangement of Russell et al., as exemplified by the attached figure, and the arrangement according to the presently claimed invention are different with respect to the coating being applied on different surfaces of the glass. According

to the Applicants claimed invention, defined by each of independent claims 1, 18

and 20, the coating is applied to the inner surface of a glass panel or any surface

facing the passenger whereas in the arrangement according to Russell et al. the

coating is applied to the outside surface of the inner glass panel of a double

glazing.

The radiation exchange, in the reference to Russell et al., between the

inner glass panel and the outer glass panel is stopped. A double glazing or

window with insulation against lost of heat is known to reduce heat and/or

thermal conduction from the inside to the outside. As a result, with the structure

of Russell et al., there is a rise of the actual temperature of the inside glass pane.

Applicants describe at page 3, second paragraph the functioning of a coated

double glazing. Applicants once again urge that the presently claimed invention

is not concerned with an arrangement for insulating against loss of heat.

Accordingly, to Applicants claimed invention the thermal radiation, which is

completely different with respect to "thermal conduction", is reflected by the "low

E" coating. Thermal radiation does not result in an increase in heat of the

interior air.

Additionally, the reference to Russell et al., as disclosed in column 56,

lines 35-40 is concerned with a completely different object then the present

invention. Column 56, lines 35-40, which coincides with the last paragraph of

claim 1 of Russell et al., indicates that the thermal control film allows for the

transmittance of a majority of the infrared radiation incident upon the thermal

Page 4 of 6

control in the 7 to 20 micron wavelength. In direct contra-distinction, according

to the present invention, the reflectivity of the coating is maximized.

The secondary references to Allemand et al., Yoneda et al. 702 and

Rensch, even accepting the statement of the rejection for their showing, add

nothing toward meeting the claim limitations of each of independent claims 1, 18

and 20 for which the dependent claims 2-12, 15-17, 19 and 21-22 depend from

and contain all of the limitations thereof.

Therefore in view of the distinguishing features between the claimed

invention and the references which features are not shown or disclosed or made

obvious by any combination of the references, Applicants once again request that

this application be allowed and be passed to issue.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Page 5 of 6

Serial No. 09/874,371

Amendment Dated: March 29, 2004

Reply to Office Action: December 29, 2003

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #080404.49983US).

Respectfully submitted,

March 29, 2004

Vincent J. Sunderdick Registration No. 29,004

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group P.O. Box 14300 Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

VJS:adb #311490



